

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-27 will be pending. By this amendment, claims 1, 12, 21, 22, 25, and 26 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Objections to the Specification

In Section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the Specification. Specifically, the Abstract of the Disclosure has been objected to for exceeding the maximum word length of 150 words. The Abstract has been further amended to reduce the word count to 44, thereby obviating the objection. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

§ 103 Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 3, and 25

In Section 3 (page 2) of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 3, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews, III *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,631,523; hereinafter referred to as “Matthews”) in view of Iwafune *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,880,720; hereinafter referred to as “Iwafune”) and Dunn (U.S. Patent No. 5,945,987).

In the Background section of the Specification, it was disclosed that “[i]n the conventional method, the information concerning the program is only known by viewing actually the program, except mere information described in a program list, or the like. Consequently, in the future, in a situation of predicted further proliferation of received programs, it will be more

and more difficult to select and view a program a viewer really wants, in a limited viewable time.” *Background of the Specification, page 2, lines 22-25.*

To solve this problem, embodiments of the present invention provide apparatus and method for processing and providing to a user broadcasting contents summary information obtained by summarizing the broadcasting contents information. For example, the structure of apparatus claim 1, as presented herein, includes:

“*user authentication means* for receiving authentication information and authenticating the user of the broadcasting contents summary information;

summary playback information storage means for storing summary playback information representing summary contents of said broadcasting contents information,

said broadcasting contents information being processed into said summary playback information in one of two ways,

wherein, in a first way, said summary playback information is automatically extracted from said broadcasting contents information when said broadcasting contents information can be uniformly processed, and

wherein, in a second way, said summary playback information is obtained by an operator by extracting an information identifier from said broadcasting contents information, and manually adding keywords when said broadcasting contents information cannot be uniformly processed;

additional screen information storage means for storing additional screen information created in correspondence to said summary playback information;

summary playback information search means for extracting said specific summary playback information from said summary playback information storage means according to a transmitted specified condition information;

additional screen information extraction means for extracting said additional screen information corresponding to said summary playback information extracted by said summary playback information search means from said additional screen information storage means;

summary contents shortening means for compressing said summary playback information extracted by said summary playback information search means according to said specified condition information; and

summary playback distribution means for distributing said additional screen information extracted by said additional screen information storage means and said summary playback information shortened by said summary contents shortening means at a timing specified by said specified condition information.”

(emphasis added)

Therefore, claim 1 includes a limitation that the summary playback information storage means holds summary playback information processed from the broadcasting contents information in one of two ways: a first way, where the summary playback information is automatically extracted from the broadcasting contents information when the broadcasting contents information can be uniformly processed; and a second way, where the summary playback information is obtained by an operator by extracting an information identifier from the broadcasting contents information, and by manually adding keywords when the broadcasting contents information cannot be uniformly processed. A support for this limitation is found in the Specification in page 39, line 12 to page 40, line 25.

Matthews, Iwafune, and Dunn, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a limitation that the summary playback information storage means holds summary playback information processed from the broadcasting contents information in one of two ways: a first way, where the summary playback information is automatically extracted from the broadcasting contents information when the broadcasting contents information can be uniformly processed; and a second way, where the summary playback information is obtained by an operator by extracting an information identifier from the broadcasting contents information, and by manually adding keywords when the broadcasting contents information cannot be uniformly processed.

Therefore, claim 1 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Iwafune, and Dunn. Since claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1, claims 2 and 3 should also be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Iwafune, and Dunn. Further, since claim 25 closely parallels, and includes substantially similar limitations as, independent claim 1, claim 25 should also be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Iwafune, and Dunn.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 2, 3, and 25 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§ 103 Rejection of Claim 4

In Section 3 (page 5) of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Iwafune and Dunn, as applied to claims 1, 2, 3, and 25 above, and further in view of Anderson *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,005,631; hereinafter referred to as "Anderson").

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding claim 1, and since claim 4 depends from claim 1, claim 4 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Iwafune, and Dunn. Further, since Anderson is indicated as disclosing a method and apparatus for organizing and searching an EPG, the combination of Matthews, Iwafune, Dunn, and Anderson still lacks all the limitations of claim 4. Therefore, claim 4 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Iwafune, Dunn, and Anderson.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claim 4 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§ 103 Rejection of Claims 5, 6, and 7

In Section 3 (page 6) of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 5, 6, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Iwafune and Dunn, as applied to claims 1, 2, 3, and 25 above, and further in view of Abecassis (U.S. Patent No. 6,553,178).

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding claim 1, and since claims 5, 6, and 7 depend from claim 1, claims 5, 6, and 7 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Iwafune, and Dunn. Further, since Abecassis is indicated as disclosing a VOD system, the combination of Matthews, Iwafune, Dunn, and Abecassis still lacks all the limitations of claims 5, 6, and 7. Therefore, claims 5, 6, and 7 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Iwafune, Dunn, and Abecassis.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 5, 6, and 7 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§ 103 Rejection of Claims 8 and 9

In Section 3 (page 7) of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Iwafune and Dunn, as applied to claims 1, 2, 3, and 25 above, and further in view of Kamada *et al.* (U.S. Patent Application No. 20030056208; hereinafter referred to as "Kamada").

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding claim 1, and since claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 1, claims 8 and 9 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Iwafune,

and Dunn. Further, since Kamada is indicated as disclosing a method and device for obtaining audience data on a TV program, the combination of Matthews, Iwafune, Dunn, and Kamada still lacks all the limitations of claims 8 and 9. Therefore, claims 8 and 9 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Iwafune, Dunn, and Kamada.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 8 and 9 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§ 103 Rejection of Claims 10 and 11

In Section 3 (page 8) of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Iwafune and Dunn, and further in view of Kamada, as applied to claims 8 and 9 above, and further in view of Goldman *et al.* (U.S. Patent Application No. 20030135853; hereinafter referred to as "Goldman").

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding claim 1, and since claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 1, claims 10 and 11 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Iwafune, and Dunn. Further, since Kamada is indicated as disclosing a method and device for obtaining audience data on a TV program, claims 10 and 11 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Iwafune, Dunn, and Kamada. Further, since Goldman is indicated as disclosing a system and method for inserting advertisements, the combination of Matthews, Iwafune, Dunn, Kamada, and Goldman still lacks all the limitations of claims 10 and 11. Therefore, claims 10 and 11 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Iwafune, Dunn, Kamada, and Goldman.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 10 and 11 based upon

35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§ 103 Rejection of Claims 12-15, 17-20, 22-24, 26 and 27

In Section 3 (page 10) of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 12-15, 17-20, 22-24, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Iwafune and Dunn and Barth (U.S. Patent Application No. 20030135864).

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding claim 1, and since independent claims 12, 22, and 26 closely parallel, and include substantially similar limitations as, independent claim 1, claims 12, 22, and 26 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Iwafune, and Dunn. Further, since Barth is indicated as disclosing a digital decoder or STB used within service-on-demand systems such as video-on-demand, the combination of Matthews, Iwafune, Dunn, and Barth still lacks all the limitations of claims 12, 22, and 26. Since claims 13-15, 17-20, 23-24, and 27 depend from claims 12, 22, and 26, claims 13-15, 17-20, 23-24, and 27 should also be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Iwafune, Dunn, and Barth.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 12-15, 17-20, 22-24, 26, and 27 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§ 103 Rejection of Claim 16

In Section 3 (page 13) of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Iwafune and Dunn and Barth, as applied to claims 12-15, 17-20, 22-24, 26, and 27 above, and further in view of Blackwell *et al.*

(U.S. Patent No. 6,449,654; hereinafter referred to as "Blackwell").

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding claim 12, and since claim 16 depend from claim 12, claim 16 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Iwafune, Dunn, and Barth. Further, since Blackwell is indicated as disclosing a system and method for retransmitting data within a cable television network, the combination of Matthews, Iwafune, Dunn, Barth, and Blackwell still lacks all the limitations of claim 16. Therefore, claim 16 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Iwafune, Dunn, Barth, and Blackwell.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claim 16 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§ 103 Rejection of Claim 21

In Section 3 (page 14) of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Iwafune.

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding claim 1, and since independent claim 21 closely parallels, and includes substantially similar limitations as, independent claim 1, claim 21 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews and Iwafune.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claim 21 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment, and the allowance of this application with claims 1-27 are respectfully solicited.

In regard to the claims amended herein and throughout the prosecution of this application, it is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes that have been made to these claims were not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes were made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.


In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number written below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



Samuel S. Lee, Reg. No. 42,791 for
William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800